

**REMARKS**

This Amendment and Response is in response to the outstanding Office Action.

**1. Present Status Of The Claims**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7 and 9-27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Microsoft front page 2000, Screen Shots, 12/31/99, pp. 1-20 (“Microsoft”), in further view of U.S Patent No. 6,538,673 (“Maslov”), and claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Microsoft in view of Maslov, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,574,898 (“Leblang”). The Applicant herewith submits remarks specifically responding to the rejections in the pending Office Action.

**2. Response To The Rejection of Claims 1-27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103.**

As stated in Applicant’s previous Response, claim 1 requires that each of the folders and subfolders depend from the tag names in the markup language file. The Office Action now combines a newly cited reference, Maslov, with the previously cited references, Microsoft and Leblang, to reject the claims. The Office Action relies solely on Maslov to allegedly teach using tag names from the markup file to name the folders and subfolders.

However, as is the case with Microsoft and Leblang, Maslov equally fails to teach the claimed method element that requires that each of the folders and subfolders depend from the tag names in the markup language file. Specifically, Maslov

provides a method for extracting digests of structured online documents, and automatic monitoring of the said digests. A digest of an online document is a collection of fragments of this document which are of interest to a user. Creation of the scripts that perform the said digest extraction and monitoring employs visual programming of the online document tree navigation and transformation. (col. 11, lns. 62-67).

The “tree” described in Maslov represents the structure of pages in the web document that the user would experience if they click through the root document displayed on the

screen. A script starts with the web page currently displayed as the root document, and proceeds down through the sub-pages or “nodes.” The combination of the starting root node and the document structure below the root node is referred to as a document “fragment” in Maslov. A script “walks” through the nodes from the root node to produce a “recorded path” from which the tree is constructed. (see col. 9, lns 5-25). This tree that is constructed in Maslov is based on the path created by this “walk” through, not the tags within an HTML or XML document. In fact, the only time that the term “tag” is even mentioned in Maslov is to indicate to the script that “walks” through a document to end when it encounters a “BODY” tag. (Col. 9, lns. 35-36) The tags themselves are not used to name any folders in Maslov.

Thus, none of the cited art, alone or in combination, describes or suggests the method claimed in claim 1, wherein the folders and subfolders depend from the tag names. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that Claim 1 is allowable. Further, claims 2-27 each depend from Claim 1, and are thus allowable for the same reason(s) that claim 1 is allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

The Applicant has made an earnest and bona fide effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing discussions, the Applicant believes that the rejections in the Office Action have been overcome. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-27 is believed to be in order, and an early Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 13, 2006



IVAN POSEY  
Reg. No. 43,865  
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER  
& STEINER LLP  
1880 Century Park East, Suite 711  
Los Angeles, California 90067  
(310) 712-8300

IP:fas